

Janette's comments on CWMNW ORU-2 mod, M118
3/23/18

Standalone #22 - Organic Recovery Unit #2 Design and Operations Plan

General comments

1. As Dan Duso confirmed in an email exchange earlier this week, the exclusion under 261.4(a)(12) does not apply. Remove all references to this section and associated language about returning organic constituents to the refinery process (e.g. Sections 2.1, 2.7).
2. General editing is needed. For example, corrections for the following should be made:
 - a. Page numbering
 - b. References to sections that don't exist (e.g. Section 6.2.3 refers to sect 3.6.1; and Section 7.2 refers to 3.6.3)
 - c. The title of Table 19-1 (and references to it) should be Table 22-1.

Specific comments

Section	Comment
1.2 and 1.4	The correct reference is 261.6(a)(3)(iv)(C)
3	Should the first sentence say 22 tanks, not 21?

Standalone #23 - WWTP-2 Liquid Storage/Treatment Plan

General comment

1. Correct all references to 40 CFR 264 (from 265).

Message

From: Knittel, Janette [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=a955f914e8d34cb19b6f63ac60707d32-Knittel, Janette]
Sent: 5/19/2017 8:26:48 PM
To: DUVAL Rich [rich.duval@state.or.us]
CC: Davies, Lynne [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=169eb6cbdebb4caf85f76390b8ab2674-LDavie12]
Subject: RE: status of reference docs for writing CWMNW ORU mod

Hi Rich,

The link below from the Louisiana DEQ EDMS website takes you to the Chem Waste Lake Charles final permit modification (March 2017) in which they added thermal desorption units. The document is quite large and will take a while to download.

<http://edms.deq.louisiana.gov/app/doc/queryresults.aspx>

If you want to search the LDEQ EDMS for other documents from this facility you could try searching AI#742 or TEMPO #PER2014007.

We're still hoping to send you the remaining documents which are mostly guidance/letters.

Are there other facilities that may have units similar to the ORU that you are aware of that we can look into in other regions?

Janette

From: Knittel, Janette
Sent: Wednesday, May 17, 2017 5:08 PM
To: DUVAL Rich <rich.duval@state.or.us>
Cc: Davies, Lynne <Davies.Lynne@epa.gov>
Subject: status of reference docs for writing CWMNW ORU mod

Hi Rich,

I know you're waiting for documents from us that you can use as references to help you figure out how to write the ORU permit mod. Lynne and I chose some to send you but we're waiting for our contact at HQ to confirm that they do not contain Confidential Business Information. There are several documents, and at least one is too large to email, so we could burn all the docs to a CD and mail it to you. I'll let you know when it's on the way.

-Janette

Janette Knittel
U.S. EPA Region 10
Office of Air and Waste
RCRA Corrective Action, Permits, and PCB Unit
1200 6th Ave, Suite 900, OAW-150
Seattle, WA 98101-3140
206-553-0483
knittel.janette@epa.gov

9498.1994(08)

CLARIFICATION REGARDING SINGLE EMISSION POINT, MULTI-DEVICE
COMBUSTION FACILITIES

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C. 20460
Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response

July 29, 1994

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Clarification Regarding Single Emission Point,
Multi-Device Combustion Facilities

FROM: Michael H. Shapiro, Director
Office of Solid Waste

TO: Allyn M. Davis, Director Hazardous Waste
Management Division, Region VI

Walter L. Sutton, Jr., Acting Regional Counsel
Office of Regional Counsel, Region VI

This memorandum is in response to your July 8, 1994, memorandum requesting clarification of a prior headquarters opinion regarding the Giant Cement Company in Harleyville, South Carolina. I understand that the recent court ruling on Marine Shale Processors has raised some questions about EPA's interpretation of the regulatory status of multi-device combustion facilities. In particular, we think that our August 11, 1992 memorandum regarding Giant Cement and Region IV's subsequent letter of November 24, 1993 was misapplied. I thus agree with Region VI that it is important to clarify this issue so that consistent determinations can be made nationwide.

This memorandum will clarify how the RCRA regulations apply to combustion devices (incinerators, industrial furnaces, and boilers) at facilities in which more than one of these devices are connected and in which the emissions from the connected devices emanate from a single emissions point. I believe the confusion arose because there are two basic issues that are encountered when applying the regulations to units in series: 1) what emission controls and

RO 13690

operating conditions are technically appropriate and will be fully protective of human health and the environment; and 2) what legal categories do the units fall into, for the purpose of determining regulatory coverage, eligibility for interim status, need for permit modifications, etc. The Giant memo addressed only the first issue, but appears to have been misinterpreted to apply to the second issue also. Following interpretation of the two issues.

Emission Controls

Giant Cement operated a hazardous waste-fired cement kiln and a number of "resource recovery kilns" burning contaminated soil. Both the off-gas and the treated-solids from the resource recovery kilns were fed into the cement kiln. The resource recovery kilns were interim status incinerators.

The Giant memo referenced above addressed only the question of what types of operational and emissions controls are appropriate to impose on connected devices with a single emissions point, by stating: "For systems of two or more hazardous waste treatment units in series, our general guideline is that a case-by-case determination of how the overall system is classified and what standards and permit conditions are applied should be based on the dominant design, operating, feed, and emissions characteristics of the system, and the most specific standards applicable to that type of system." We still believe this type of flexible approach is important because of the difficulty, from an engineering standpoint, of applying two sets of potentially conflicting emission standards (e.g., the Part 264 Subpart O incinerator standards and the Part 266 Subpart H boiler and industrial furnace (BIF) standards) to a single emissions point on a series of devices which are connected.

In performing a technical evaluation of what standards should be applied to a group of units in series, it will usually be necessary to look at the reasoning behind the regulatory requirements, as expressed in preambles and guidance documents, and not simply at the regulatory requirements. Based on this type of evaluation, if two sets of emissions standards fit equally well from a technical standpoint, preference should be given to the more stringent standards. If not, the standards which are most-appropriate technically, considering their regulatory rationale, should be applied. In addition, the permit writer should consider whether additional conditions beyond the regulations are

necessary to tailor the permit to the specific system and site in order to protect human health and the environment (through use of the RCRA 3005(c)(3) omnibus authority).

It should also be noted that there may be cases, such as where two or more combustion devices operate in parallel and share only a common stack, in which the determination of what standards to apply is straightforward (i.e., unit by unit). The principal remaining issue in this situation is how to do the testing to determine whether each unit is meeting the standards.

Permitting/Interim status Determination

The above determination of the most technically appropriate and protective emissions controls to apply in the permit for interconnected devices must be distinguished from the classification of the devices for purposes of determining interim status eligibility and other issues. Because Giant had already attained interim status separately for its "resource recovery kilns" as incinerators and for its cement kiln as an industrial furnace, the August 1992 memorandum did not address nor need to address the classification of these devices for such purposes.

For the same reason, Region IV's November 24, 1993 letter to Giant Cement indicating that the resource recovery kilns would now be subject to hazardous waste incinerator emission standards because the combusted contaminated soil from those units was being disposed and not put into the cement kiln, dealt only with the issue of what emission standards would apply to these kilns. These earlier documents addressed the only question asked, which is what emission standards should apply.

In recognition of the practical difficulties of applying more than one set of standards to a single emission point, these documents discussed the criteria to be used in determining what emission standards should apply to that point. Under the principles discussed in these documents, EPA may determine, for example, that the emissions from a process train involving an incinerator and a cement kiln are most appropriately regulated under the emissions standards applicable to cement kilns. This does not mean that the incinerator "becomes" a cement kiln; it simply means that the common emission point should be regulated under the cement kiln standards.

These documents did not intend to suggest that the individual units in a process train lose their unit identities. The separate identities of the individual units in a process train is relevant in the context of facilities seeking to obtain interim status, among other situations. Under EPA regulations, a facility that is "in existence" on the effective date of a statutory or regulatory change that subjects it to the requirement to obtain a RCRA permit may obtain interim status by submitting Part A of its permit application and complying with statutory notification requirements. 40 CFR 270.70(a). A unit that is already subject to the permit requirement cannot obtain interim status upon the promulgation of regulations bringing a different type of unit into the RCRA system. See 56 FR at 7142 (February 21, 1991) (aggregate kiln burning hazardous waste for destruction and thereby subject to the rules for incinerators is not newly eligible for interim status when BIF rules are promulgated).

In reviewing a Part A application form filed by a facility seeking interim status following the regulation of a new type of unit, EPA evaluates whether the unit (or units) identified on the form were of the newly regulated type. In performing this evaluation, EPA would compare the unit with the unit-definitions set forth in its regulations, irrespective of whether the unit was self-contained or part of a process train. In particular, if the unit and other units shared a common emission point, the regulatory emission standards determined to be most technically appropriate for that point would be irrelevant to the identity of the unit in question.

The pertinent definitions for combustion devices are the definitions of "boiler", "industrial furnace", and "incinerator" in 260.10. The definition of boiler is based on unit design. Industrial furnaces are an enumerated list of devices that are parts of manufacturing processes and incinerators are devices which are not boilers or industrial furnaces. The list of industrial furnaces is not written in terms of device systems; it describes particular devices: "cement kilns", "aggregate kilns", "halogen acid furnaces", etc. Consequently, a device would normally need to fit one of these descriptions to be an industrial furnace.

The Agency's interpretation is that the list of industrial furnaces applies on a device-by-device basis whenever the devices are combusting separate (i.e., not from another device in the series) hazardous wastes. The only exception would be where the

Agency has indicated unequivocally (normally in the context of a notice-and-comment rulemaking) that the definition of that industrial furnace type applies to multiple devices. The only device for which the Agency has done so are cement kiln precalciners, which EPA agrees are invariably operated as part of one cement-manufacturing operation, even if the precalciner is separately fired with hazardous waste (see footnote 1). See, e.g., 54 FR at 43761 (Oct. 26, 1989). The Agency did not consider the effect of emissions from other connected hazardous waste units when it promulgated the BIF rule.

The interpretation that the industrial furnace definition is to be read to apply to each combustion device burning separate hazardous waste is consistent with the literal language of the industrial furnace definition. It is also consistent with statutory provisions requiring that hazardous waste combustion can only be performed pursuant to stringent regulatory control, RCRA sections 3004(o)(1)(B) and 3004(q), and that hazardous waste be properly managed in the first instance. RCRA section 1003(a)(5). These goals would be circumvented if hazardous waste-fired units were simply considered to be part of the industrial furnace. Before the BIF rules became effective, for example, this would mean that the additional unit -- an incinerator -- could burn hazardous waste without any regulatory control.

This interpretation covers the case of two hazardous waste fired devices. If the additional device is not hazardous waste fired, then it could be considered to be part of the industrial furnace. The Agency has in fact indicated in explanatory preambles and other interpretive documents that industrial furnaces can include certain integrated components that pretreat materials or assist in air pollution control. See, e.g., 56 FR at 42598 (August 27, 1991). So long as these devices are not burning separate hazardous wastes, they do not raise the core RCRA concerns discussed above, and can accordingly be regulated as part of the industrial furnace (see footnote 2).

Example

To illustrate the application of the above principles to combustion units in series, consider the following example. The owner/operator of an interim status cement kiln chooses to add an afterburner to help achieve control of PIC emissions (see 57 FR at

38561 (Aug. 27, 1991) where EPA suggested this course as a means of reducing organic emissions) and further chooses to fire the afterburner with hazardous waste. The hazardous-waste fired afterburner is not a cement kiln, but rather is a separate device: an incinerator (see footnote 3). It is not on the list of industrial furnaces, and it is engaged in the type of activity -- hazardous waste combustion -- for which regulatory controls are mandated. Thus, the afterburner is ineligible for interim status as part of the cement kiln. The facility would have to apply for a change during interim status under 270.72(a)(3) for addition of a process and receive Director approval based on meeting the criteria in that section.

However, in the same example, if the cement kiln were to add an afterburner which is not hazardous waste-fired, the Agency would not view this action as adding an incinerator. By not separately combusting hazardous waste, the hypothetical afterburner is not separately engaged in hazardous waste treatment. Rather, it is simply treating emissions from a hazardous waste treatment device, and so is considered part of that device. In such a case no regulatory approval under the change during interim status provisions is needed to add the device, and the afterburner becomes part of the interim status cement kiln.

I hope this has clarified the issue of how to address interconnected combustion devices. If you have further questions, feel free to call me, or have your staff contact Sonya Sasseville at (703) 308-8648.

cc: Matt Straus, Fred Chanania, Dev Barnes, Matt Hale, Frank McAlister, Larry Starfield, Steve Silverman, Terry Sykes, Laurie King, Waste Combustion Permit Writers' Workgroup, Subpart X Permit Writers' Workgroup

- 1 While the Agency may have identified other devices which do not separately fire hazardous waste as part of an industrial furnace, precalciners are the only hazardous waste-fired devices for which such an interpretation has been made.
- 2 This is not intended to imply that the presence of an afterburner not separately fired with hazardous waste on a non-controlled flame device never affects the regulatory classification of that device. In the case of plasma arc and infrared units, the Agency has classified

those devices as incinerators when they have afterburners (considering the plasma arc or infrared device plus the afterburner to be one unit) and as Subpart X devices when they do not. (See 56 FR 7204, 57 FR 38562, and incinerator definition at 40 CFR 260.10.) It is expected that there will be other situations in the future where the Agency will be developing separate definitions for units in series. This will be done through rulemaking, as appropriate.

- 3 EPA officials have in fact given this advice to cement kilns contemplating adding afterburners to assist in meeting emission controls for products of incomplete combustion.

HEINONLINE

Citation: 56 Fed. Reg. 7204 1991



Content downloaded/printed from *HeinOnline*

Mon Apr 3 17:46:36 2017

- Your use of this HeinOnline PDF indicates your acceptance of HeinOnline's Terms and Conditions of the license agreement available at <http://heinonline.org/HOL/License>
- The search text of this PDF is generated from uncorrected OCR text.

is not promulgating an exemption from regulation of the hydrocarbon phase of the landfill gas condensate at this time. Facilities that wish to burn a landfill gas condensate may consider whether they are eligible for the small quantity burner exemption promulgated in this rule.

V. Definitions of Infrared and Plasma Arc Incinerators

Today's rule establishes definitions for infrared and plasma arc incinerators and revises the definition of incinerator to explicitly include these devices. As discussed in the April 27, 1990 proposed amendments to the incinerator standards (55 FR at 17869-70), EPA is clarifying that these devices are incinerators rather than (other) thermal treatment units subject to regulation under subpart X of part 264 (or subpart P of part 265 for interim status units) because: (1) although these devices use nonflame sources of thermal energy to treat waste in the primary chamber, they invariably employ controlled flame afterburners to combust hydrocarbons driven off by the primary process (and, thus, they meet the definition of an "incinerator" under § 260.10); and (2) the incinerator standards are workable and protective for these units.

We note that today's action merely clarifies the regulatory status of these devices. It does not subject them to regulation for the first time; they have been regulated since 1980. Thus, interim status is not reopened for these devices.

Part Five: Administrative, Economic, and Environmental Impacts, and List of Subjects

I. State Authority

A. Applicability of Rules in Authorized States

Under section 3006 of RCRA, EPA may authorize qualified States to administer and enforce the RCRA program within the State. (See 40 CFR part 271 for the standards and requirements for authorization.) Following authorization, EPA retains enforcement authority under sections 3008, 7003 and 3013 of RCRA, although authorized States have primary enforcement responsibility.

Prior to the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (HSWA), a State with final authorization administered its hazardous waste program entirely in lieu of EPA administering the Federal program in that State. The Federal requirements no longer applied in the authorized State, and EPA could not issue permits for any facilities in the State which the State was authorized to permit. When new, more stringent Federal requirements

were promulgated or enacted, the State was obliged to enact equivalent authority within specified time frames. New Federal requirements did not take effect in an authorized State until the State adopted the requirements as State law.

In contrast, under section 3006(g) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6926(g), new requirements and prohibitions imposed by HSWA take effect in authorized States at the same time that they take effect in nonauthorized States. EPA is directed to carry out those requirements and prohibitions in authorized States, including the issuance of permits, until the State is granted authorization to do so. While States must still adopt HSWA-related provisions as State law to achieve or retain final authorization, the HSWA applies in authorized States in the interim.

The majority of today's rule is promulgated pursuant to section 3004(q) of RCRA, a provision added by HSWA. (The provisions that are not promulgated pursuant to HSWA are the provisions for sludge dryers, carbon regeneration units, infrared incinerators, and plasma arc incinerators.) Therefore, the Agency is adding the requirements (except the non-HSWA provisions) to Table 1 in § 271.1(j) which identifies the Federal program requirements that are promulgated pursuant to HSWA and that take effect in all States, regardless of their authorization status. States may apply for either interim or final authorization for the HSWA provisions identified in Table 1, as discussed in the following section of this preamble.

B. Effect on State Authorizations

As noted above, EPA will implement the majority of the provisions of today's rule in authorized States until they modify their programs to adopt these rules and the modification is approved by EPA. Because these provisions of the rules are promulgated pursuant to HSWA, a State submitting a program modification may apply to receive either interim or final authorization under section 3006(g)(2) or 3006(b), respectively, for these provisions on the basis of requirements that are substantially equivalent or equivalent to EPA's. The procedures and schedule for State program modifications for either interim or final authorization are described in 40 CFR 271.21. It should be noted that all HSWA interim authorizations will expire January 1, 1993. (See § 271.24(c).)

The provisions of today's rule that are not promulgated pursuant to HSWA—provisions for sludge dryers, carbon regeneration units, infrared incinerators, and plasma arc incinerators—are not

effective in authorized States. Thus, these requirements will be applicable only in those States that do not have final authorization. In authorized States, the requirements will not be applicable until the State revises its program to adopt equivalent requirements under State law.

40 CFR 271.21(e)(2) requires that States that have final authorization must modify their programs to reflect Federal program changes, and must subsequently submit the modifications to EPA for approval. The deadline by which the State must modify its program to adopt the HSWA portion of today's rule is July 1, 1993 if a statutory change is not needed, or July 1, 1994 if a statutory change is needed. The deadline by which the State must modify its program to adopt the non-HSWA portion of today's rule is July 1, 1992 if a statutory change is not needed, or July 1, 1993 if a statutory change is needed. These deadlines can be extended in certain cases (40 CFR 271.21(e)(3)). Once EPA approves the modification, the State requirements become Subtitle C RCRA requirements.

States with authorized RCRA programs may already have requirements similar to those in today's rule. These State regulations have not been assessed against the Federal regulations being promulgated today to determine whether they meet the tests for authorization. Thus, a State is not authorized to implement these requirements in lieu of EPA until the State program modification is approved. Of course, States with existing standards may continue to administer and enforce their standards as a matter of State law.

In implementing the Federal program for the HSWA portion of today's rule, EPA will work with States under cooperative agreements to minimize duplication of efforts. In many cases, EPA will be able to defer to the States in their efforts to implement their programs, rather than take separate actions under Federal authority.

States that submit their official applications for final authorization less than 12 months after the effective date of these standards are not required to include standards equivalent to these standards in their application. However, the State must modify its program by the deadlines set forth in § 271.21(e). States that submit official applications for final authorization 12 months after the effective date of these standards must include standards equivalent to these standards in their application. 40 CFR 271.3 sets forth the requirements a State

9489.1994(01)

CLARIFICATION ON THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THERMAL DESORBERS AND
INCINERATORS

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C. 20460
Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response

February 23, 1994

Mr. David D. Emery
President
Bioremediation Service, Inc.
P.O. Box 2010
Lake Oswego, Oregon 97035-0012

Dear Mr. Emery:

This is in response to your December 21, 1993, letter requesting clarification on the distinction between thermal desorbers and incinerators. In particular, you questioned whether temperature was a criterion for distinguishing between desorbers and incinerators and whether chlordane contaminated soil can be effectively and safely treated by thermal desorption.

Under the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) regulations, thermal treatment units that are enclosed devices using controlled flame combustion and that are neither boilers nor industrial furnaces are classified as incinerators subject to regulation under 40 CFR Part 264, Subpart O. Definitions of boilers, industrial furnaces, and incinerators are established in 40 CFR 260.10. Thermal treatment units that do not use controlled flame combustion and that are not industrial furnaces are classified as "miscellaneous units" subject to regulation under 40 CFR Part 264, Subpart X.

The use of "controlled flame combustion" determines whether EPA regulates a device used for thermal desorption as an incinerator or a "miscellaneous unit". Consequently, a thermal desorber would be subject to regulation as an incinerator if it was equipped with a fired afterburner to destroy desorbed organic compounds, or if the desorption chamber was directly fired, irrespective of how the desorbed organics were controlled. On the other hand, if the desorption chamber was indirectly heated and the desorbed organics were not controlled using controlled flame combustion (e.g., no afterburner), the thermal desorber would be subject to regulation as a "miscellaneous unit". Thus, in response

RO 13657

to your questions, temperature is not a criterion that is used to determine the regulatory status of a thermal desorber.

EPA's regulations for miscellaneous units are not prescriptive given the variety of devices that fall into this category. Rather, the regulations require the permitting official to establish permit conditions that are necessary to protect human health and the environment. For "miscellaneous" thermal treatment units, permit writers will generally require compliance with all of the Subpart O incinerator standards that are appropriate for the technology and then determine if additional controls are needed to ensure that emissions are safe.

Please note that I have described EPA's regulatory classification approach for thermal desorbers. Under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, EPA authorizes the States to implement the hazardous waste management regulatory program. State regulations may be more stringent or broader in scope than EPA's. Therefore, you should check with the State in which the facility in question is to be located to identify any applicable standards.

With respect to your question as to whether chlordane contaminated soil can be effectively and safely treated by low temperature desorption, you should contact EPA's technical expert on thermal desorption, Paul de Percin, Office of Research and Development, for assistance. Mr. de Percin can also be consulted about TCDD conjugation but, without full thermodynamic and kinetic data regarding the process involved, it may be difficult to give you any definitive assistance. He can be reached at 513-569-7797.

I hope that this information will be helpful. If you have further questions about the regulatory classification of thermal desorbers, please contact Bob Holloway of my staff at 703-308-8461.

Sincerely,
Michael Shapiro
Director
Office of Solid Waste

cc: Paul de Percin; Bob Holloway

HEINONLINE

Citation: 55 Fed. Reg. 17869 1990



Content downloaded/printed from HeinOnline

Mon Apr 3 17:54:07 2017

- Your use of this HeinOnline PDF indicates your acceptance of HeinOnline's Terms and Conditions of the license agreement available at <http://heinonline.org/HOL/License>
- The search text of this PDF is generated from uncorrected OCR text.

be addressed under the SIP process or potentially by a RCRA permit writer using the omnibus permitting authority.

In developing today's proposed rule, a number of people representing a wide range of interests (e.g., industry representatives, environmentalists) have indicated, however, that the rule may be simpler to implement and more protective if the controls were technology-based. They advocate using risk assessment only as a check to determine if the standards are protective on a site-specific basis. They cite the current limitations of risk-based standards in this particular situation, including: (1) indirect exposure (e.g., uptake through the food chain) has not been considered for carcinogens; (2) metals controls are proposed only for those metals for which sufficient health effects data exist to establish acceptable ambient levels; and (3) the metals controls are difficult to implement by limiting feed rates of individual metals given the physical matrices of wastes and the variability of metals concentrations. We agree with these concerns and are initiating a testing program to develop technology-based controls for particulate matter to provide a measure of control for particulates, including metal particulates and adsorbed organic compounds, commensurate with best demonstrated technology (BDT) for hazardous waste incinerators. See RCRA section 3004(a)(1)—section 3004 standards are to be revised periodically to take into account improvements of measurement and technology. If EPA establishes a BDT particulate standard, the risk-based controls for metals emissions would still apply and would then be used as a check to determine if the BDT standard provides adequate protection on a case-by-case basis. Given the limitations of current risk assessment methodologies, we do not believe that it could be demonstrated that a BDT standard substantially over-regulates in many situations.

We are not proposing at this time to lower the existing particulate standard because we have not conducted adequate field testing of hazardous waste incinerators to establish a BDT particulate standard.¹² Further, once the

BDT standard is identified, we would then need to consider the impact on the regulated community of applying the standard to establish a reasonable compliance schedule.

II. Definitions of Incinerators and Industrial Furnaces

We discuss below the basis for proposing to revise the definitions of incinerator and industrial furnace, the regulatory status for sludge dryers, and a request for comment on regulating all hazardous waste thermal treatment devices under parts 264 and 265, subpart O.

A. Definition of Incinerator and Industrial Furnace

Existing definitions in § 260.10 for incinerators and industrial furnaces consider how thermal energy is provided to the device. Both definitions stipulate that the device must utilize controlled flame combustion, thus excluding devices using other means to supply the heat necessary to combust or otherwise thermally treat waste. Thus, for example, electric arc smelters are not industrial furnaces and devices using infrared heat to destroy waste are not incinerators. Significant regulatory consequences result from these determinations. Electric arc smelters that reclaim nonindigenous metal hydroxide sludges are not industrial furnaces, and, thus, are exempt from regulation under § 261.6(c)(1), while smelters using direct flame combustion to reclaim the same sludge would be regulated under the May 6, 1987, proposed rules for boilers and industrial furnaces. Infrared devices used to destroy waste would be regulated under the subpart X permit standards of part 264 and the subpart P interim status standards of part 265, while controlled flame incinerators would be regulated under subpart O of parts 264 and 265 (and any amendments resulting from today's proposal). The subpart X permit standards under part 264 are not prescriptive; permit writers use engineering judgment and risk analysis to determine appropriate permit conditions.

We believe that incinerators and industrial furnaces pose much the same risk irrespective of whether they use controlled flame combustion or some other means to provide heat energy. Therefore, we are proposing to replace or temper the reference to controlled flame combustion in respective definitions.

1. *Revised definition of industrial furnace.* We are proposing to revise the definition of industrial furnace to refer to thermal treatment rather than to

controlled flame combustion. We believe that there are very few additional industrial furnaces (that process nonindigenous waste) that would be regulated under this expanded definition, and it makes no sense to regulate these few furnaces differently than other industrial furnaces processing the same materials. EPA specifically requests comments on the need for the revised industrial furnace definition and resultant impacts on the regulated community.

2. *Plasma arc and infrared devices are incinerators.* We are proposing to revise the definition of incinerator to include explicitly two nonflame combustion devices: plasma arc and infrared incinerators. Although these devices are sometimes considered to be nonflame devices rather than incinerators, we believe that they should be regulated as Subpart O incinerators for two reasons. First, they invariably employ afterburners to combust hydrocarbons driven off by the plasma arc or infrared process. Thus, it can be argued that these units, in fact, meet the current definition of an incinerator. Second, we believe that the Subpart O incinerator standards can be appropriately applied to these devices; the technical requirements of subpart O are appropriate to address the hazards posed by these devices. We also note that applying the Subpart O standards will reduce the burden on both permit writers and applicants. The Subpart X standards are nonprescriptive standards under which permit writers apply permit conditions as appropriate to protect human health and the environment. Thus, under subpart X, permit writers would need to determine on a case-by-case basis whether particular provisions of subpart O are appropriate and whether additional permit conditions would be needed. Using Subpart O standards removes the ambiguity for both permit writers and applicants over what requirements are necessary.

Today's proposed amendments to the incinerator standards likewise appear suitable for plasma arc and infrared incinerators. We request comment on whether there are other "nonflame" combustion devices for which the Subpart O incinerator standards are applicable (i.e., devices that use an afterburner to combust hydrocarbons generated from hazardous waste by a nonflame process).

We note that we are proposing only to change (or clarify) the regulatory status of these two classes of devices, not to subject them to regulation for the first time. Thus, interim status is not being reopened for these devices. They have

¹² We note that several States control hazardous waste incinerator particulate emissions to levels well below EPA's standard of 0.08 gr/dscf. In addition, several hazardous waste incinerators have been demonstrated to be capable of routinely controlling particulate emissions to levels in the 0.01–0.02 gr/dscf range, or less. Further, as discussed above in the text, the proposed particulate standard for MWCs is 0.015 gr/dscf. Thus, we anticipate that a BDT particulate standard for hazardous waste incinerators would be within that range of 0.01 to 0.02 gr/dscf.

been regulated since 1980 under subpart P (interim status standards for thermal treatment units), subpart X (permit standards for other treatment units), or subpart O (interim status and permit standards for incinerators). We note that the interim status standards of part 265, subpart P, are virtually identical to the interim status standards of part 265, subpart O.

3. *Fluidized bed devices are incinerators.* EPA would also like to clarify that fluidized bed devices are incinerators and are regulated under subpart O. They are not subject to the thermal treatment standards of part 265, subpart P, or requirements established under part 264, subpart X. Fluidized bed incinerators are enclosed devices that are designed to provide contact between a heated inert bed material fluidized with air and the solid waste. Gas is passed upwards through a column of fine particulates at a sufficient velocity to cause the solids/gas mixture to behave like a liquid. The bed is preheated by overfired or underfired auxiliary fuel. It is generally accepted that fluidized beds meet the definition of incinerator, although there may have been some confusion in the past. Although we are clarifying that they do meet the definition of incinerator, we specifically request comment on whether there is sufficient ambiguity to warrant adding fluidized bed devices to the definition of incinerator.

4. *Revised regulatory status of carbon regeneration units.* We are also proposing to revise the regulatory status of carbon regeneration units. Controlled flame carbon regeneration units currently meet the definition of incinerator and have been subject to regulation as such since 1980,¹³ while carbon regeneration nonflame units have been treated as exempt reclamation units. We are proposing to regulate both direct flame and nonflame carbon regeneration units as thermal treatment units under the interim status standards of part 265, subpart P, and the permit standards of part 264, subpart X. Our reason for doing this is that we are concerned that emissions from these devices may present a substantial hazard to human health or the environment. We are not proposing to

apply the part 264, subpart O, incinerator standards to these units because we are concerned that demonstration of conformance with the DRE standards (and the proposed CO/THC standards) may not be achievable considering the relatively low levels of toxic organic compounds absorbed onto the activated carbon.

The prevailing view appears to be that carbon regeneration units currently are exempt recycling units. We have considered whether or not these units truly are engaged in reclamation, or whether the regeneration of the carbon is just the concluding aspect of the waste treatment process that commenced with the use of activated carbon to absorb waste contaminants, which are now destroyed in the "regeneration" process.¹⁴ Irrespective of whether these units are better classified as waste treatment or recycling units (or whether the units are flame or nonflame devices), we are concerned, as indicated above, that emissions from the regeneration process can pose a serious hazard to public health if not properly controlled. Consequently, nonflame units in existence on the date of promulgation (like flame units) would be subject to part 265, subpart P, and new units would be subject to part 264, subpart X.

We note that we intend for this proposal to also apply to those carbon regeneration units that meet the definition of wastewater treatment units in § 260.10 while they are in active service. These units would not be exempt from regulation when they are being regenerated because they are no longer treating wastewater. Rather, the activated carbon columns themselves are being treated thermally.

B. Regulation of All Thermal Treatment Units Under Subpart O

The Agency has done some preliminary thinking on an alternative approach to regulating combustion devices—the regulation of all thermal treatment devices under virtually identical standards under subpart O. This would avoid a number of problems with the current regulatory approach, including: (1) Ambiguous definitions for boilers and industrial furnaces; (2) incomplete coverage of the incinerator and industrial furnace definitions (e.g.,

although today's proposal would expand regulatory coverage of industrial furnaces to include heating by means other than controlled flame combustion, furnaces other than those that are "integral components of a manufacturing process" (see § 260.10), such as off-site facilities engaged solely in waste management, could be engaged in *bona fide* reclamation and should be classified as an industrial furnace rather than an incinerator); (3) the burden on the regulated community and EPA and State officials to process petitions to classify individual devices as boilers or industrial furnaces rather than incinerators; and (4) the numerous provisions in the proposed boiler and furnace rules that would merely parrot the current and proposed incinerator standards.

Under this alternative approach, all thermal treatment devices would be regulated under the same risk-based standards to control metals and HCl emissions—the standards proposed today for incinerators.¹⁵ Control of organic emissions could also be the same as those CO controls proposed today for incinerators coupled with the existing DRE standards for incinerators. Devices handling wastes with low levels of toxic organic constituents (e.g., smelters, sludge dryers, certain incinerators), however, would not be subject to organic emissions controls. The applicability of standards could, in many cases, be a function of waste properties and composition. It may not be necessary to identify applicability by type of device.

EPA is continuing to consider this alternative. In particular, we are investigating whether the temporary exclusion for the special wastes in RCRA section 3001(b)(3) and the special standards and exemptions proposed for boilers and industrial furnaces can be implemented without definitions for these devices. We specifically request comments on this alternative regulatory approach whereby all thermal treatment units could be regulated under one set of standards under subpart O.

PART THREE: DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED CONTROLS

I. Overview of EPA's Risk Assessment

In developing this regulation, the Agency has used risk assessment to: (1) determine that absent regulatory

¹³ There appears to be confusion as to the current regulatory status of direct flame activated carbon regeneration units. Because EPA indicated in the May 19, 1980, preamble that all activated carbon regeneration units were engaged in a form of recycling presently exempt from regulation (45 FR 33094), EPA is proposing in this notice to amend the regulations to control these devices, both direct and indirect fired. Consequently, the "in existence" date for all activated carbon regeneration units would be the date of promulgation of final regulations.

¹⁴ We note that activated carbon units used as air emissions control devices frequently regenerate the carbon in place by steam stripping, condensing the organic contaminants for reuse. The trapped organics in such columns are not hazardous wastes because the gas originally being treated is not a solid waste (it is an uncontained gas), and therefore any condensed organics do not derive from treatment of a listed hazardous waste.

¹⁵ We note that EPA is requesting comment on applying these controls (as well as the proposed CO controls) to boilers and industrial furnaces as well in lieu of those proposed on May 6, 1987. See the Federal Register notice published today entitled, "Burning of Hazardous Waste in Boilers and Industrial Furnaces: Supplement to Proposed Rule."

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF
SOLID WASTE AND EMERGENCY
RESPONSE

Mr. Parker E. Brugge
Patton Boggs, L.L.P.
2550 M Street, N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-1350

Dear Mr. Brugge:

This letter is in response to your April 7, 1998, letter seeking clarification on the distinction between thermal desorbers and incinerators. Under the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) regulations (40 CFR 260.10), thermal treatment units that are enclosed devices using controlled flame combustion, and that are neither boilers nor industrial furnaces, are classified as incinerators subject to regulation under 40 CFR Part 264, Subpart O. Thermal treatment units that do not use controlled flame combustion, and that are neither boilers nor industrial furnaces, are classified as "miscellaneous units" subject to regulation under 40 CFR Part 264, Subpart X.

EPA regulations do not define "thermal desorber", but the term generally applies to a unit that treats waste thermally to extract the contaminants from the matrix. A thermal desorber utilizing controlled flame combustion (e.g., equipped with a directly fired desorption chamber and/or a fired afterburner to destroy organics) would meet the regulatory definition of an incinerator. On the other hand, a thermal desorber that did not use controlled flame combustion (e.g., equipped with an indirectly heated desorption chamber and the desorbed organics were not "controlled"/destroyed with an afterburner) would be classified as a "miscellaneous unit".

With regard to the September 1993 Presumptive Remedy guidance entitled: "Presumptive Remedies: Site Characterization and Technology Selection for CERCLA Sites with Volatile Organic Compounds in Soils" (Directive Number 9355.0-48FS) that you mentioned, EPA identified thermal desorption and incineration as the second and third preferred technologies, respectively. The intent of the guidance is that units that can be generally described as thermal desorbers, whether or not they are also incinerators, are second in the preference list. However, if a thermal desorber that meets the RCRA definition of incinerator is used to treat hazardous waste at a CERCLA site, the unit must meet RCRA's incinerator standards, EPA developed the preferential order set out in this guidance based on historical patterns of remedy selection and EPA's

RO 14266

scientific and engineering evaluation of performance data on technology implementation. There was no intent implied or stated in the Presumptive Remedy guidance that the preferential order was based on the temperature of operation; the guidance does not limit the thermal desorbers technologies to those that are low-temperature thermal desorbers.

We appreciate that as technologies evolve, the distinctions between units often become blurred, and, in the case of thermal desorbers, may fail within two separate classifications depending on the design of the unit. Classification of a "thermal treatment" unit, however, is defined by 40 CFR 260.10.

Both the RCRA regulatory framework and the CERCLA remedy selection process provide adequate flexibility to ensure that the unit is operated in a protective manner and that there is adequate and informed public participation. If you have any further questions, please contact either Andrew O'Palko, Office of Solid Waste, at (703) 308-8646 or Robin Anderson, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, at (703) 603-8747.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Cotsworth
Acting Director
Office of Solid Waste

Sincerely,

Stephen D. Luftig
Director
Office of Emergency and
Remedial Response

cc: Andrew O'Palko, OSW
Bob Holloway, OSW
Robin Anderson, OERR
Karen Kraus, OGC
Superfund Regional Response Managers
RCRA Senior Policy Advisors

PATTON BOGGS, L.L.P.

2550 M STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20037-1350
(202) 457-6000 (202) 457-5225

April 2, 1998

Ms. Elizabeth A. Cotsworth
Acting Director
Office of Solid Waste
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street, S.W. (5301W)
Washington, D.C. 20460

Dear Ms. Cotsworth:

I am writing to seek clarification on the distinction between thermal desorbers and incinerators.

It is my understanding that thermal treatment units which are enclosed devices using controlled flame combustion, and that are neither boilers nor industrial furnaces, are classified as incinerators subject to regulation under 40 CFR Part 264, Subpart O. It is also my understanding that thermal treatment units which do not use controlled flame combustion, and that are not industrial furnaces, are classified as "miscellaneous units" subject to regulation under 40 CFR Part 264, Subpart X.

Thus, a thermal desorber is subject to regulation as an incinerator if it is equipped with a fired afterburner, or if the desorption chamber is directly fired. However, I would assume that, although such a device is subject to regulation under Subpart O, it nevertheless remains a "thermal desorber." The fact that it must meet the standards set forth in Subpart O for incinerators does not transform it somehow into an incinerator for CERCLA purposes.

For example, EPA issued guidance in September 1993 explaining that at a Superfund site which has soil contaminated with volatile organic compounds, the range of remedial technologies set forth in a Record of Decision may be soil-vapor extraction ("SVE"), low-temperature thermal desorption ("LTTD"), and incineration. The preferred order is SVE, LTTD, and, as a last resort, incineration. A thermal desorber with a fired afterburner, or one whose desorption chamber is directly fired, must fall within the "thermal desorption" family of technologies, even though it would be subject to regulation under Subpart O as an incinerator.

To hold otherwise would disqualify the large majority of LTTD units, which are directly fired and use afterburners for air pollution control. This result would be contrary to EPA's CERCLA guidance and to the Administrator's emphasis on reducing incineration which involves the high-temperature burning of contaminated soil.

RO 14266

ED_002469_00000376-00003

PATTON BOGGS, L.L.P.
Ms. Elizabeth A. Cotsworth
April 2, 1998
Page 2

There appears to be some confusion on this issue, for which we would appreciate your help in clarifying. Please call me if you have any questions or if you would like to discuss this issue further.

Sincerely,

Parker E. Brugge

cc: Bob Holloway

RO 14266

ED_002469_00000376-00004